

**WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP**

BENEDICT Y. HUR (SBN: 224018)

bhur@willkie.com

SIMONA AGNOLUCCI (SBN: 246943)

sagnolucci@willkie.com

EDUARDO E. SANTACANA (SBN: 281668)

esantacana@willkie.com

ARGEMIRA FLOREZ (SBN: 331153)

aflorez@willkie.com

One Front Street, 34<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111

Telephone: (415) 858-7400

Facsimile: (415) 858-7599

Attorneys for Defendant

GOOGLE LLC

**BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP**

Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)

mmao@bsflp.com

Beko Reblitz-Richardson (CA Bar No. 238027)

brichardson@bsflp.com

44 Montgomery Street, 41<sup>st</sup> Floor

San Francisco, CA 94104

Tel: (415) 293-6858

Fax: (415) 999-9695

**SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.**

William Christopher Carmody (pro hac vice)

bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com

Shawn J. Rabin (pro hac vice)

srabin@susmangodfrey.com

One Manhattan West, 50th Floor

New York, NY 10001

Telephone: (212) 336-8330

**MORGAN & MORGAN**

John A. Yanchunis (pro hac vice)

jyanchunis@forthepeople.com

Ryan J. McGee (pro hac vice)

rmcgee@forthepeople.com

201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor

Tampa, FL 33602

Telephone: (813) 223-5505

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, et al. individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-CV-04688-RS

**JOINT STIPULATION ON GOOGLE'S  
SUPPLEMENTAL FINANCIAL  
PRODUCTIONS**

Judge: Hon. Richard Seeborg

Courtroom: 3, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor

1 Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-2 and 7-12, Plaintiffs Anibal Rodriguez, et al. (“Plaintiffs”)  
2 and Defendant Google LLC (“Google”), collectively referred to as the “Parties,” hereby enter into  
3 this joint stipulation.

4 WHEREAS, Plaintiffs’ expert witness Michael J. Lasinski offers opinions on Google’s  
5 unjust enrichment from Google’s collection, saving, and use of (s)WAA-off app activity data;

6 WHEREAS, Google’s rebuttal expert witness Christopher R. Knittel offers opinions in  
7 response to Mr. Lasinski, including with respect to Google’s enrichment from its collection, saving,  
8 and use of (s)WAA-off app activity data;

9 WHEREAS, the Parties and their experts rely on financial reports produced by Google in  
10 calculating and otherwise opining on Google’s enrichment from (s)WAA-off app activity data;

11 WHEREAS, because the discovery period in this case ended before the class period ended,  
12 the financial reports produced by Google during the discovery period did not include information  
13 regarding Google’s revenues and costs for a later portion of the class period;

14 WHEREAS, after the end of the discovery period in this case, Google changed its accounting  
15 systems, including certain relevant reporting structures and reporting systems;

16 WHEREAS, after the class period ended, Google produced to Plaintiffs certain financial  
17 reports regarding Google’s revenues and costs through the end of the class period;

18 WHEREAS, as a result of the changes to Google’s accounting systems, the metrics included  
19 in these financial reports differ from the metrics included in the financial reports produced by  
20 Google during the discovery period;

21 WHEREAS, the Parties wish to at trial avoid any dispute or confusion by the jury regarding  
22 the contents of these Google financial reports and to ensure that the Parties’ experts are both working  
23 from the same understanding regarding the content of these reports; and

24 WHEREAS, the Parties agree that the below stipulated facts may be included in the Joint  
25 Pretrial Statement.

26 NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the  
27 Parties, that:

1 With respect to Google's revenues and profits from **App Promo** ads:

- 2 1. The spreadsheet produced by Google and numbered GOOG-RDGZ-00185743 is authentic  
3 and admissible into evidence at trial;
- 4 2. In the spreadsheet numbered GOOG-RDGZ-00185743, the "AppPromoQuarterlyRevenue"  
5 in Column E of the "Data" tab is from App Promo ads served to users in the United States;
- 6 3. The spreadsheet produced by Google and numbered GOOG-RDGZ-02111189 is authentic  
7 and admissible into evidence at trial;
- 8 4. In the spreadsheet numbered GOOG-RDGZ-02111189, the "AppPromoQuarterlyRevenue"  
9 in Column E of the "Output" tab is Google's "served" revenue from App Promo ads served  
10 to users in the United States;
- 11 5. In the spreadsheet numbered GOOG-RDGZ-02111189, the "gross\_revenue\_floating\_usd" in  
12 Column G of the "Follow Up Output" tab is Google's total "served" revenue from App Promo  
13 ads served to users around the world;
- 14 6. In the spreadsheet numbered GOOG-RDGZ-02111189, the "tac\_floating\_usd" in Column H  
15 of the "Follow Up Output" tab is Google's total traffic acquisition costs ("TACs") pertaining  
16 to App Promo ads served to users around the world;
- 17 7. The spreadsheet produced by Google and numbered GOOG-RDGZ-02111196 is authentic  
18 and admissible into evidence at trial;
- 19 8. In 2022, Google updated its profit-and-loss ("P&L") reporting structure to a new format for  
20 its App Promo and AdMob products;
- 21 9. Google's updated P&L reporting structure, used through 2024, does not track or maintain  
22 Google's "booked" revenue specific to App Promo ads;
- 23 10. For the period after Google updated its P&L reporting structure, Google's "billed" revenue  
24 from App Promo ads is the best available proxy, or substitute, for Google's "booked" revenue  
25 from App Promo ads;
- 26 11. In the spreadsheet numbered GOOG-RDGZ-02111196, the "SUM of billed\_usd\_glfx" in  
27 Column F is Google's "billed" revenue from App Promo ads served to users in the United  
28 States;
12. In the spreadsheet numbered GOOG-RDGZ-02111196, Google's "billed" revenue is  
calculated by deducting from "served" revenue certain transactions the customer is not billed  
for such as overdelivery, spam credits, etc., as well as including certain fees (for example,  
regulatory fees);
13. For purposes of this litigation, Google states that as it relates to Google's revenues from App  
Promo ads, the ratio of "served" to "billed" revenue during 2023 was not materially different  
from the ratio of Google's "served" to "billed" revenue during 2022;
14. Google's 2022–2024 accounting structure does not track, report, or otherwise maintain  
country-specific records of Google's traffic acquisition costs for App Promo ads;

1 15. For purposes of this litigation, Google states that Google's traffic acquisition costs as a  
2 percentage of Google's corresponding App Promo revenues did not materially change after  
2021 and through the end of the class period, which is September 23, 2024;

3 16. As of October 1, 2023, the share of global App Promo ad revenue attributable to conversion  
4 types bid against Google Analytics for Firebase was 66%; and

5 17. As of October 1, 2024, the share of global App Promo ad revenue attributable to conversion  
types bid against Google Analytics for Firebase was 70.5%.

6 With respect to Google's revenues and profits from **AdMob**:

7 18. The spreadsheet produced by Google and numbered GOOG-RDGZ-02111197 is authentic  
8 and admissible into evidence at trial;

9 19. In the spreadsheet numbered GOOG-RDGZ-02111197, the "Hardcoded Sellside P&L | non-  
10 M" tab includes Google's total served and booked revenues from AdMob ads served to users  
around the world;

11 20. In the spreadsheet numbered GOOG-RDGZ-02111197, the figures in the "Hardcoded  
12 Sellside P&L | non-M" tab were generated by Google, from the same accounting systems,  
and using the same methods, that Google used to generate the figures in the spreadsheets  
13 numbered GOOG-RDGZ-00187665 and GOOG-RDGZ-00187666 to recreate the pre-2022  
reporting structure to the best of its ability. It does not represent how Google currently reports  
14 these figures in the ordinary course of business;

15 21. After Google updated its P&L reporting structure in 2022, it stopped maintaining non-MECE  
views, meaning traffic acquisition costs associated with AdMob ads in the years 2022, 2023,  
16 or 2024, are MECE, unlike the non-MECE figures in previous years, which are included in  
the spreadsheets numbered GOOG-RDGZ-00187665 and GOOG-RDGZ-00187666;

17 22. Google's traffic acquisition costs as a percentage of Google's corresponding AdMob  
18 revenues remained relatively stable between 2021 and 2023.

19 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

20 DATED: April 18, 2025

By: /s/ Mark C. Mao  
Mark C. Mao

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

24 DATED: April 18, 2025

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER, LLP

25 By: /s/Benedict Y. Hur  
Benedict Y. Hur

*Attorneys for Google*

**FILER'S ATTESTATION**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 5.1, I attest that all signatories listed, and on whose behalf this filing is submitted, concur in the filing's content and have authorized this filing.

DATED: April 18 2025

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP

/s/ Mark C. Mao  
Mark C. Mao